

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/733,896	PINZON ET AL.	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____

(1) Nathan M. Nutter. (3) _____.

(2) Courtney Meeker. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 May 2007 **Time:** 10:00 am

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

See Continuation Sheet

Claims discussed:

318-336

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of rejections discussed: Claims 318-334 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrari (USPN 6,402,408) or Ross et al (USPN 5,500,209) taken with Palinczar (USPN 4,699,779) Mondet (USPN 6,180,123) or Arnaud et al (USPN 5,961,998).

Claims 335 and 336 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Appellants are informed of the allowability of claims 335 and 336 since the rejection of these claims under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is expressly withdrawn in view of appellants' Brief pertaining thereto. Appellants have decided to incorporate the allowable subject matter of the allowed claims 335 and 336 into the independent claim 318. Incorporation of this subject matter removes the reasons for the ground of rejection under 35 USC 103, above. Since Terminal Disclaimers have been filed to remove the obviousness-type rejection of Double patenting, no issues remain.